

A. F. Frickling

# Answers

to

Questions submitted by the Board of Directors

of

The San Francisco Theological Seminary

at the request of the

Synods of California and Washington

by

Rev. Thomas Franklin Bay, D. D.

Gray Professor of Hebrew Exegesis and Old Testament Literature



# Answers

to

Questions submitted by the Board of Directors

of

The San Francisco Theological Seminary

at the request of the

Synods of California and Washington

by

Rev. Thomas Franklin Day, D. D.

Gray Professor of Hebrew Exegesis and Old Testament Literature



Copyright 1910  
by  
Charles A. Laton

## Preface

Of the following questions only the first eleven were included in the request made by the Synods of California and Washington. The others were added to the list in accordance with the action taken by the Synod of California "that the Board be further directed to institute such other inquiries as the Board may think proper." (Minutes of Synod of California for 1909, p. 49.)

In answering the questions I have endeavored to be brief, as well as explicit. It has been difficult to compress into a few sentences the essential points involved in each case. The full statement would have included much which has been necessarily omitted.

The literature submitted under the head of "References" is to be understood as supplementing my answers. Only works in English are included. The list is by no means exhaustive. The references for the most part are to works in which the modern view is explained and defended. This restriction was intended. It was due to no desire to seem to give the impression that the traditional view does not have abundant supporters. I wished to show the strength of the modern critical position by using the works of a few representative authors. It is unquestionably true, that of the important books which have been written during the last two decades, those which support the modern view have preponderated.

None of the positions here set down as my own has been hastily adopted. I hold them subject to revision in the light of new evidence. They are submitted with a sincere desire to promote a true knowledge of the Scriptures.

They contravene, I must believe, neither the spiritual message of the Bible, nor the intent and spirit of Presbyterian doctrine.

THOMAS FRANKLIN DAY.

San Anselmo, California.  
April 25, 1910.



Ia - passed, b- 165 n.  
93 y.  
II

## Professor Day's Answers to Questions

### QUESTION I.

Was the Pentateuch written by Moses, and under the inspiration of God?

### ANSWER

There are two questions here. (a) "Was the Pentateuch written under the inspiration of God?" Answer: I believe that it was so written. (b) "Was the Pentateuch written by Moses?" Answer: Moses, who, under God, was the founder of both the Hebrew religion and the Hebrew nationality, set in motion the spiritual forces that gave to the entire Old Testament its peculiar stamp. It is probable that a part of the contents of the Pentateuch came from his hand. The opinion that he did not write it all, nor the major part of it, does not rest upon a denial of his literary ability, but upon facts gathered from the Pentateuch itself. The evidence includes many technical details, but the main conclusion is that the Hexateuch consisted originally of four documents belonging to different periods. These documents are characterized by certain repetitions and discrepancies, and differences in style and ideas, which it is felt cannot be reconciled with one another on the theory that they came from one hand, or originated in the same age. It is believed that a comparison of the data given in the Pentateuch with the facts recorded in the historical books confirms the conclusions of modern critics respecting the number, the character, and the chronological order of these documents.

I am led by my own study of the question to accept the view outlined above, viz., that the Pentateuch, with the exception of a possible nucleus, is not the work of Moses, but the product of various hands, and that its constituent documents date from various periods, according to the law of progressive development in religious ideas and usages. (See under Question IV.)

### REFERENCES

Articles on Hexateuch, Genesis, Exodus, etc., in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, in 5 vols.; Hastings' 1 vol. Dictionary; The Standard Bible Dictionary.

Introductions to the Old Testament, by Driver, Cornill, McFadyen.

W. Robertson Smith, "Old Testament in the Jewish Church."

George Adam Smith, "Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament."

Kent, "The Student's Old Testament," Vol. 1. "The Historical Bible," Vol. 1.

Mitchell, "The World Before Abraham."

Commentaries: Driver, Dillmann and Delitzsch, on Genesis; Gray, on Numbers; Driver, on Deuteronomy.



## Professor Day's

### QUESTION II.

Is the account of the creation of the world and of man, as also, the account of the fall of man, as given in Genesis historically true?

#### ANSWER

There are really two questions here. (a) "Is the account of the creation of the world and of man as given in Genesis historically true?" Answer: The account of the creation of the world and of man, which is contained in the first chapter of Genesis, differs in important particulars from the account given in the second chapter. The differences would indicate that the two accounts are of different origin. In substance they are true, for their purpose is to teach the fact of a divine creation. In his representation of the manner of creation each writer shares the limitations and reflects the ideas of his time. The attempt to maintain their literal accuracy is beset by so many difficulties that most recent interpreters have abandoned it. It is best to think of them as religious rather than as strictly historical or scientific documents.

(b) "Is the account of the fall of man as given in Genesis historically true?" Answer: We may distinguish between the spiritual fact and its literary garb. The narrative is an example of ancient modes of accounting for things which for the Hebrew people were of the essence of faith. The fact of human sinfulness was accepted as a fact of experience. How to account for the origin of it was a problem which occupied thoughtful minds. One of the early explanations is given in this chapter. Perhaps it was meant originally as a serious attempt to solve the problem. It does not follow that we are obliged to accept it in all its bald literalness.

If anyone wishes to do so, I admit his right. I think it better to interpret the words as symbolical of a great spiritual truth. No explanation is tenable which denies or obscures the fact of sin.

#### REFERENCES

- Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 1, article on "Cosmogony."  
Hastings' 1 Vol. Dictionary, article on "Creation."  
Standard Bible Dictionary, article on "Cosmogony."  
Lenormant, "The Beginnings of History."  
Worcester, "Genesis in the Light of Modern Knowledge."  
Ryle, "The Early Narratives of Genesis."  
Zimmern, "The Babylonian and the Hebrew Genesis."  
Gordon, "The Early Traditions of Genesis."  
Driver, "Westminster Commentary on Genesis."

### QUESTION III.

Is the Book of Exodus to be accepted as a correct account of the events

## Answers to Questions

it purports to relate? Particularly, as regards the redemption of the Hebrews from Egypt, and the giving of the Decalogue?

#### ANSWER

There are here three questions, one general and two specific. I take them in their order. (a) "Is the Book of Exodus to be accepted as a correct account of the events it purports to relate?" Answer: The Book of Exodus, according to the modern view, was compiled from three original documents. (See, under Question IV.) Three different viewpoints, therefore, are represented, with resulting variations in the record. The earlier sources rest on a substantial basis of fact, though all three writers seem to have somewhat idealized the past. But in spite of their lack of historic sense, they served the larger interests of historical truth better than they knew. The book is of great historical value, for it not only contains a substantially true account of conditions existing at the time of the exodus, but also furnished data for the history of a much later age.

(b) "Is the account correct as regards the redemption of the Hebrews from Egypt?" Answer: I accept the account as true.

(c) "Is the account of the giving of the Decalogue correct?" Answer: The Decalogue, in whole or in larger part, was of Mosaic origin; "the reasons annexed" belonging, however, to a subsequent age.

#### REFERENCES

- (a) Articles on "Exodus" in Hastings and the Standard Dictionaries. Bacon, "The Triple Tradition of the Exodus."  
(b) Articles on "Israel" in Hastings and the Standard.  
(c) Articles on "Decalogue" or "Ten Commandments" in the Hastings and Standard Dictionaries.  
Kautzsch: The Religion of Israel (in extra volume of Hastings' Dictionary) pp. 633f.

### QUESTION IV.

Was the Levitical Law, as recorded in the Book of Leviticus, given by the Lord to Israel? If so, was it given during the sojourn in the wilderness, or at a later date? If later, about what time?

#### ANSWER

There are here three separate questions.

(a) "Was the Levitical Law, as recorded in the Book of Leviticus, given by the Lord to Israel?" Answer: The whole body of Hebrew law was given by Jehovah, in the sense that its underlying principle was divinely communicated to Moses, the first Hebrew legislator. The law had a threefold character; judicial, ceremonial, and moral. The word



## Professor Day's

"Law" is variously applied. It may refer to the teaching of the prophets, the instruction of the sage, the admonitions of a parent or the direction of the priest. It was associated most frequently with the work of the priests. It was oral at first, and rested largely upon custom and precedent, but under new conditions it also created precedent. Undoubtedly Moses was the promulgator of the original body of the oral law.

The first codification, or written law, belongs probably to the time of Israel's settlement in Canaan. It underwent successive revisions to satisfy the requirements of later ages. According to the opinion of most recent writers, the principal codes were four, viz.: the Book of the Covenant, the Deuteronomic, the Holiness, and the Priestly Codes, named in order of succession.

The first, the Book of the Covenant, is contained in Exodus, Chaps. 20-23; 34:10-26. Its requirements were simple, as befitted primitive social conditions. Altars were permitted wherever a need for them arose. The "sojourner" had no legal standing in Israel, but was not to be oppressed.

The second, or Deuteronomic Code, forms part of the present Book of Deuteronomy. It was framed under the influence of the teaching of the great pre-exilic prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. It contained more elaborate provisions, suited to a more advanced state of society. The only legal altar was to be at a certain prescribed place. The "sojourner" held practically the same position as in the Book of the Covenant. He was not subject to certain requirements which the Israelite must obey. In all the enactments relating to the priesthood, Levites and priests were regarded as identical.

The third code, known as the "Holiness Code," because it laid stress on the holiness of Jehovah, and on the necessity of the people's becoming holy, was probably the work of a contemporary of Ezekiel. It is contained in Leviticus, chapters 17-26.

The fourth code, or Levitical (by pre-eminence the "Priestly Code") is found mainly in the books of Leviticus and Numbers, but partly in Genesis and Exodus. It incorporated the older code just mentioned, viz., the Law of Holiness. This fourth code contains more extensive and detailed provisions than any of the others. Many of its laws are at variance with those of the Book of the Covenant and the Deuteronomic Code. To mention only two instances: The sojourner is declared to be under the same law as the homeborn. (Lev. 24:22.) (See Deut. 14:21.) The priests and the Levites are sharply differentiated, only the former having the right to exercise the priestly office, the latter being relegated to the position of menials. Such instances, and they are numerous, form part of the evidence on which the hypothesis of a progressive series of legislative codes is based. The hand of God is seen in the entire process.

(b) "Was it (the Levitical Law) given during the sojourn in the wilderness, or at a later date?" Answer: It was probably not given during the sojourn in the wilderness, but belongs to a later date.

(c) "If later, about what time?" Answer: It is the opinion of

## Answers to Questions

scholars, other than those who accept the traditional view, that the Levitical Code was formulated not earlier than the time of the exile, and in this opinion I concur.

### REFERENCES

- Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. II.  
Article "Hexateuch" and Vol. III. Articles "Law in the Old Testament," and "Leviticus."  
Standard Bible Dictionary, articles "Hexateuch," "Law and Legal Practice," and "Leviticus."  
Briggs, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch.  
Addis, The Documents of the Hexateuch.  
Kent, Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents.  
(Student's Old Testament, Vol. IV.)  
Sanders and Kent, Messages of the Law-givers (in Messages of the Bible series).  
Bennett, A Primer of the Bible.  
Cornill, The Prophets of Israel, pp. 153-163.  
Harper, The Priestly Element in the Old Testament.

### QUESTION V.

Are the so-called Messianic predictions in the Old Testament, beginning with Genesis and closing with Malachi, veritable, inspired prophecies concerning Jesus Christ?

### ANSWER

I can state my view more satisfactorily if I begin with a definition of prophecy. Prophecy is the inspired preaching of divine truth as it bore directly on the life and thought of the prophet's contemporaries. Even when predictive, it took its cast and color from the circumstances of the time. It was not necessarily history told beforehand. It was not a miraculous unrolling of future events. And yet its survey embraced past, present and future. Its purpose was to instruct, convict, comfort, inspire.

The burden of predictive prophecy on its brighter side was the Messianic hope. This hope was expressed in various forms. Each prophet depicted some phase of the anticipated blessing. No one outlined it in its completeness. The Messiah was at best only the instrument through which Jehovah should execute His gracious purpose. He occupied, therefore, a subordinate place in the representation, and sometimes dropped out of sight entirely. The central figure was always Jehovah Himself.

The old way of looking at the prophets as looking down the ages and seeing the very Christ, and foretelling His coming with explicit mention of the details of His future earthly existence must yield to the truer conception which is one of the fruits of the historical study of the Bible. But it takes time to assimilate the new conception. When rightly understood it helps to solve many puzzling questions. The Messianic features



## Professor Day's

were so diverse that no one could possibly have drawn from them beforehand a portrait of the historical Christ. Nor was this necessary. The unifying of the various elements was possible only in the light of the incarnation.

We know by experience that it is easier to take the measure of things after they have gone than before they come. One sees more gazing backward than forward. It is better then to take our stand at the Advent and say that Jesus Christ fulfills in Himself the ideals of Old Testament prophecy. This truth is to be taken, I think, spiritually and in the large, and not as guaranteeing the fulfillment of every minute prediction, nor as vouching for the prophet's foreknowledge of the historic Christ. All the true prophets spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, but under necessary limitations. In its essence, viz., its ideal spiritual content, their message belonged to the future, while in its form it was the combined product of the prophet's individuality and environment. The divine treasure was in earthen vessels. The vessels were successively broken because incapable of containing the whole idea, which expanded as it matured, until it reached its culmination in Christ.

### REFERENCES

- I. For the ultra-conservative view, see Hengstenberg; Christology of the Old Testament. 4 Vols. Eng. Trans. of 2nd Ed., 1854-8. (Very influential a generation ago.)
- II. More critical, but occupying a more or less traditional standpoint.
  - Briggs: Messianic Prophecy, 1886. (Of great value.)
  - Orelli: Old Testament Prophecy, 1889, pp. 1-73.
  - Delitzsch: Messianic Prophecies. Eng. Trans., 1891.
  - Beecher, W. J.: The Prophets and the Promise, 1905, Chs. 12 to 16. (In some of its conclusions agreeing with the more critical school.)
- III. Works of a more or less decided modern tendency. Stanton: The Jewish and the Christian Messiah, 1886.
  - Riehm: Messianic Prophecy. Eng. Trans., 1891. (A valuable book.)
  - Kirkpatrick: The Doctrine of the Prophets, 1892. Ch. 18, Christ the Goal of Prophecy. (Important.)
  - Woods: The Hope of Israel, 1896. (Clear, popular.)
  - Ottley: Aspects of the Old Testament, 1897. Ch. 6.
  - Goodspeed: Israel's Messianic Hope, 1900. Ch. 10. (Deals with Apocalyptic.)
  - Davidson, A. B.: Old Testament Theology, 1904; pp. 356-395. (Pub. after author's death, without his final revision. Contains much that is valuable.)
  - Davidson, A. B.: Old Testament Prophecy, 1903. Chs. 18-20.
  - Dalman: The Words of Jesus, 1902. Ch. 11, Christ.
  - Edgehill: The Evidential Value of Prophecy.
  - Mathews: The Messianic Hope in the New Testament, 1905.

## Answers to Questions

Oesterley: Evolution of the Messianic Idea, 1909.

### IV. Dictionary Articles.

Kautzsch: Religion of Israel, in extra vol. Hastings, pp. 694ff.

Stanton: "Messiah," Hastings' Dictionary, Vol. 3.

Whitehouse: "Messiah" in Diet. of Christ and the Gospels.

Mathews: "Messiah" in One-Volume Hastings' Diet.

Zenos: "Messiah" in Standard Bible Dictionary.

### V. Commentaries.

Kirkpatrick: On the Psalms, 1903. (One-Volume Edition is the best. One of the very best commentaries in English on the Psalms. See Introduction, Ch. 8, The Messianic Hope, pp. lxxvi-lxxxv.)

Briggs: International Critical Commentary on the Psalms. Vol. 1, 1906. Vol. 2, 1907. (Dr. Briggs was assisted by his daughter in writing this commentary. It is a work of immense learning. It is more radical in its textual criticism than Kirkpatrick. Its treatment of the Messianic element is conservative.)

Cheyne: Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, 4th Edition, 1886. (See Essay III, The Christian Element, in the Book of Isaiah; Essay IV, The Servant of Jehovah; Essay V, The Suffering Messiah; Essay VI, The Present State of the Critical Controversy.) (An excellent and suggestive commentary.)

Delitzsch: Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, 4th Edition. Trans. 1892. (It is important, when reading Delitzsch to get the 4th edition, for in it he announces his acceptance of the modern view regarding the structure of the book.)

### VI. Periodicals.

See articles by Professor Edward A. Wicher, D. D., on "Ancient Jewish Views of the Messiah" in The Biblical World for November and December, 1909.

### QUESTION VI.

What is the authorship, and what the probable date of Isaiah?

### ANSWER

According to the majority of recent scholars who have written on the subject, the book of Isaiah is not the work of a single author. Isaiah of Jerusalem is considered the author of a considerable part of chapters 1 to 39. Of the remaining chapters, 40 to 55, at least, are confidently referred to the period of the exile. The author of this portion is not known. Chapters 56 to 66 may belong to a still later period. The agreement among scholars regarding the date of the last eleven chapters is not so general as it is upon that of chapters 40 to 55. The reasons which support this general conclusion respecting the authorship of the book relate to such matters as style, historical background, and theological ideas. Each line of thought is clear and convincing to many minds, but the cumulative force of the evidence is felt only when



## Professor Day's

it is considered as a whole. No one denies that the historical Isaiah could have uttered all the prophecies contained in the book, had Jehovah chosen to inspire him for the purpose. The question concerns not the divine power, but the divine method. The analogy of prophecy shows that ordinarily God chose living men in every age to speak the word appropriate to its needs. Why seek to explain the origin of the great sermons contained in chapters 40 to 55 on any other theory? Had the historic Isaiah preached these sermons to his contemporaries, they would not have understood them. The message, "Comfort ye, comfort ye," was not due till a hundred and fifty years after Isaiah's time, when the Hebrew exiles found in Babylon their Slough of Despond.

That the ancient "Isaiah-roll" contained the work of later prophets may be due to the ignorance of the scribe, or to his desire to make his rolls of uniform size. This does not in any sense affect the inspiration of the book, for inspiration depends on the contents of the prophecy, not on our knowledge of its human author or authors.

### REFERENCES

- Delitzsch: Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, 4th Ed.  
Cheyne: The Prophecies of Isaiah.  
George Adam Smith: Isaiah, in the Expositor's Bible.  
Skinner: Isaiah, in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.  
Driver: Isaiah and His Times, in "Men of the Bible" series.  
G. A. Smith: "Isaiah, Book of," in Hastings' One-Vol. Dict.  
Edouard Koenig: "Isaiah" in the Standard Dictionary. (Prof. Koenig is in the University of Bonn.)  
Koenig: The Exiles' Book of Consolation.  
Kirkpatrick: The Doctrine of the Prophets, Lect. xiii, "Isaiah of the Exile."

### QUESTION VII.

Is the book of Jonah, as we have it, a veritable history? And is its prophecy veritable prophecy?

### ANSWER

(a) "Is the book of Jonah veritable history?" There is no reason why the book of Jonah could not be regarded as a veritable history, so far as the possibility of miracle is concerned. The question is not, could the things therein recorded have occurred, but did they occur? Applying the same rule to the story of the rich man and Lazarus, we reach the same result. Doubtless that story could have been the record of an occurrence. The question is, was it such a record? When we call this story a parable, we take it out of the category of historical narratives. We do the same when we call the book of Jonah a parable, and this is what most modern interpreters are inclined to do. It does not seem that Jesus' reference to Jonah necessi-

## Answers to Questions

tates its historical verity, any more than would the taking of Jesus' parables as the basis of a comparison compel us to assume their historical truth.

(b) "Is the book of Jonah veritable prophecy?"

Answer: Defining prophecy as "inspired preaching to the times," we are bound to say that the book of Jonah is a prophetic book. Its parabolic character is not only far easier to maintain, but its prophetic purpose is thereby brought into clearer light. What was that purpose? It was apparently to convict the Jews of the writer's day of shameful narrowness in wishing to exclude the people of outside nations from the privileges of the religion of Jehovah. Jonah thus becomes a type of Israel, and Israel's exile in Babylon is symbolized by the prophet being swallowed by a great fish, which figuratively represents the Babylonian empire. (See Jer. 51: 34-44.) The book is thus a veritable prophetic writing, bearing the marks of inspiration, and is, besides, one of the most beautiful and artistic compositions to be found in all literature.

### REFERENCES

- George Adam Smith: Jonah, in The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vol. II. (Expositor's Bible.)  
Cornill: The Prophets of Israel, 1895, pp. 170-173.  
Driver: Introduction to the O. T., 6th Ed., pp. 320-325.  
Cornill: Introduction to the O. T., 1907, pp. 336-9.  
McFadyen: An Introduction to the O. T., 1905, pp. 196-9.  
Koenig: "Jonah," in Hastings' Dict., Vol. II. (Elaborate discussion.)  
Zenos: "Jonah," in the Standard Bible Dictionary.  
Bonus: "Jonah" in Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.  
W. Taylor Smith: "Jonah," in Hastings' One-Volume Dict.  
Kleinert: "Jonah," in Lange's Commentary.  
C. H. H. Wright: Introduction to the O. T., 1890, pp. 207-12.  
Kirkpatrick, in his "The Doctrine of the Prophets," omits the book of Jonah.  
Elmslie: "Jonah" in Book by Book, 1892.  
Gladden: Seven Puzzling Bible Books, 1897.

### QUESTION VIII.

To about what date does the book of Daniel belong? Is its history veritable history, and its prophecy veritable prophecy?

### ANSWER

Here are three questions.

(a) "To about what date does the book of Daniel belong?" Answer: In all probability it belongs to the early years of the Maccabean period, about 165 B. C. This date is not arbitrarily fixed by men who are fond



## Professor Day's

of change. It is the result of a careful examination of the facts presented by the book. It is confirmed by a comparison of the book of Daniel with other apocalyptic writings, of which it seems to have been the precursor and model.

The facts on which the opinion is based are:

(1) The position which the book occupies in the Jewish Canon, not among the prophets, but in the later and more general collection of "Hagiographa."

(2) The writer of Ecclesiasticus (about 200 B. C.) in giving a list of illustrious Hebrews, names Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and (collectively) the minor prophets, but omits Daniel.

(3) Various apparent errors of statement, which only a later writer would be likely to make.

(4) The Hebrew of Daniel is later, and Persian and Greek words are found in it, while the Aramaic portion is not of the Babylonian, but the Palestinian type.

(5) The theological ideas (regarding the kingdom of God, angels, resurrection, final judgment) betray a later date.

(b) "Is it veritable history?" Answer: The book has two parts. Chapters 1-7 contain narratives, each one pointed with a "moral." I do not consider these narratives as literal history, in their present form, though some of them may have a nucleus of historical fact; but they are of the nature of Midrashim, that is, stories adorned with literary embellishments whose purpose was to teach a lesson, or to encourage those in trouble. The Maccabean period was one in which comfort and stimulus were sorely needed, and the book of Daniel was peculiarly adapted to this purpose. Chapters 7-12 are apocalyptic in character.

(c) "Is its prophecy veritable prophecy?" Answer: If the book of Daniel is an apocalyptic writing, it contains for the most part predictions written after the events. The detailed descriptions of, and allusions to, historical events and personages belonging to the Babylonian, Medo-Persian and Grecian periods up to the year 165 are, it is believed, drawn from the writer's more or less accurate memory of what he had learned from books or other sources. They are probably not the predictions of Daniel the prophet, but were attributed to him by the author of the book. Of a similar character is the book of Enoch, which is quoted in the epistle of Jude, v:15, as if it were "veritable prophecy" uttered by the antediluvian of that name. No scholar of repute would say that Enoch ever spoke the words attributed to him.

Nevertheless, the book of Daniel does contain "veritable prophecy," and it is this which gives it its prophetic character. This will appear when we distinguish between true prophecy and history in the guise of prophecy. Both types appear in the book. The real predictions belong to the writer of the book and not to Daniel. They relate to the future age which was to succeed immediately that in which the writer lived. They refer to the triumph of the Jewish people after their persecutions

## Answers to Questions

are ended. They have the true prophetic quality. They describe the future in terms borrowed from the writer's surroundings, but noticeably in a far less detailed fashion than is the case with those which refer to times then past.

This view of the book relieves it of many difficulties. It is the one presented in most of the recent commentaries and dictionaries of the Bible, and is the view which I hold.

### REFERENCES

Driver: The Book of Daniel, 1905, in the Cambridge Bible. (Best handy commentary on Daniel.)

Ottley: The Hebrew Prophets, 1898.

Sanday: Inspiration (Bampton Lectures, 1893), pp. 215ff.

Article on "Daniel" in each of the recent Bible Dictionaries.

Articles on "Apocalyptic Literature" in these dictionaries.

The Introductions to the O. T. by Driver, Cornill, McFadyen.

Riggs: History of the Jewish People, 1900, pp. 7, 8, 9.

Fairweather: The Background of the Gospels, 1908, see Index.

### QUESTION IX.

Did Jesus Christ and His Apostles, when quoting from the Old Testament, mean to authenticate it as the Word of God? And consequently, as having divine authority?

### ANSWER

There are here two questions, but they are really one, for if the Old Testament is the Word of God, it possesses divine authority.

Christ and His Apostles did most certainly regard the Old Testament as the authoritative Word of God and the living source of spiritual instruction. The belief shines out from almost every page of the New Testament. As a child Jesus imbibed His religious ideas from the Old Testament, and as a public teacher He made constant reference to it with characteristic familiarity and reverence. The New Testament writers make copious quotations from the Old Testament, directly or by allusion, for purposes of illustration, admonition and argument. The fact here stated is not to be minimized on the ground that their quotations from the O. T. were marked by a freedom far beyond what one would naturally expect to find. As showing their spirit and method in dealing with the O. T. the following facts are of interest:

1. Jesus probably habitually spoke Aramaic. Whether He knew Greek or not, the language which He employed in public teaching was that which he learned from His mother's lips. The Gospels in only a few instances record His original utterances. As for the rest, they give the Greek equivalent. For this reason we cannot say with certainty what



## Professor Day's

was Jesus' usual method of quoting from the O. T. We may, however, infer that He quoted freely rather than with literal exactness. The inference receives support from two facts: 1st: The method of the Apostles, which they apparently learned from, and practised in common with, the Master, was that of informal citation, and, 2nd: Jesus exalted the spirit above the letter in such sayings as "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (John 6:63), a saying that finds echo in Paul's declaration—"The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." (2nd Corinthians, 3:6.)

II. We have direct evidence touching the methods of the Apostles. Only a few of the most apparent features will be mentioned. (For examples under each head see references given below.)

(a) There were three sources from which they could make quotation, the original Hebrew, the Greek (Septuagint) translation, and the Aramaic paraphrase. The Apostles quoted indifferently from one or the other of these.

(b) Of the two hundred and seventy-five quotations, only about one-fifth agree with the original Hebrew.

(c) The New Testament writers quoted from the Septuagint, even though it differed from the Hebrew.

(d) They altered the Septuagint or the Hebrew for the sake of the argument, or for literary reasons.

(e) Their quotations frequently show slips of memory.

(f) They sometimes made an independent paraphrase instead of citing the original.

(g). They used quotations for their immediate purposes without regard to the original context.

(h) They added or took away words, according as it suited their purposes.

(i) They combined two or more quotations, sometimes with the result that the original sense was in part changed or contradicted.

The remarkable thing about all this is that profound reverence for Holy Scripture was felt to be consistent with such free handling of its words and ideas.

### REFERENCES

- F. H. Woods: Article on "Quotations" in Hastings' Dict., Vol. IV.  
 F. B. Denio: Article on "Quotations" in the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.  
 G. Currie Martin: "Old Testament (II. Christ as Student and Interpreter of)" in the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. (An interesting and suggestive treatment of the subject.)  
 Marcus Dods: The Bible, Its Origin and Nature. Ch. 4.  
 Burton: Constructive Studies in the Life of Christ. 3d. Ed., 1905, pp. 101-5.  
 Gilbert: Interpretation of the Bible, 1908, Ch. 3.  
 Toy: Quotations in the New Testament, 1884. Introduction.

## Answers to Questions

### QUESTION X.

In general, do you accept the Old Testament, as we now have it, as the authentic and authoritative Word of God? Barring, of course, such minor interpolations and mistakes as may have crept in through the errors of copyists?

### ANSWER

(a) I accept the Old Testament as we now have it, when cleared of errors of copyists, as the authentic and authoritative Word of God for the people of God in the ancient time. I so accept it, also, notwithstanding any errors which modern criticism may have discovered, either in the writings themselves, or in the opinions that have been held in the past concerning them.

(b) I accept it as authoritative for the Christian disciple in so far as it is in harmony with the spirit and teaching of our Lord. If in anything it is contradictory to that spirit, I choose the Master rather than the imperfect forerunner as my spiritual guide. My study of the Old Testament has led me to a deeper appreciation of its power and beauty and permanent spiritual value, in spite of the fact that some of the conceptions of God therein recorded are obsolete for the follower of Jesus Christ. The Old Testament must be tested by the touchstone of Christ's spiritual teaching. I profoundly believe that when it shall have been submitted to this test, the Christian can use the Old Testament with a more joyous, because more discriminating, faith.

### REFERENCES

- Sanday: The Oracles of God.  
 Marcus Dods: The Bible—Its Origin and Nature. Chas. III. (Revelation), IV. (Inspiration) and V. (Infallibility).  
 Sanday: Inspiration (Bampton Lectures), 1893. Lect. viii (See especially pp. 399-401).  
 A. Stewart: "Bible," in Hastings' Dict., Vol. I., 296-9 (Remarks on "Inspiration").  
 Gilbert: Interpretation of the Bible.  
 Farrar: History of Interpretation.  
 Simon: The Bible Theocratic Literature, 1886.  
 Horton: Revelation and the Bible. 3d Ed., 1896, pp. 1-25, 403-7.  
 Mead: Supernatural Revelation (Stone Lectures, 1889), Ch. 10, "The Authority of the Scriptures."  
 Zenos: "Revelation" (Revelation and Inspiration) in the Standard Bible Dictionary.  
 Kirkpatrick: The Divine Library of the Old Testament, 1891.

### QUESTION XI.

Do you believe it to be your duty, as a teacher in the Seminary, simply



## Professor Day's

to state diverse and conflicting views that may be held touching the integrity and authority of Holy Scripture, leaving your pupils to draw their own conclusions? Or, do you feel it to be your duty to impress upon your pupils what you believe to be correct views, and this, with the earnestness of assured and settled conviction?

### ANSWER S

I believe it to be my duty as a teacher in the Seminary to stand to my pupils in the relation of counsellor and guide as well as instructor. When there are diverse and conflicting views touching subjects that belong to my department, I believe it to be my duty to draw attention to these.

I distinguish between questions of criticism and questions of doctrine; between the plain facts of Scripture and possible inferences that may be drawn from them. I believe it to be my duty as a teacher to show the student how to make the distinction.

I believe and teach that either the traditional or the modern critical view of the Old Testament may be held by Evangelical Christians, consistently with a firm belief in its divine inspiration. I regard questions concerning the dates and human authorship of the various books as of secondary importance as compared with the fundamental spiritual meaning, and I so teach.

Inasmuch as a reasonable criticism has not overthrown my belief in the spiritual integrity and authority of the Bible, I am glad to make the fact known to those with whom it is my privilege to labor. And when I find for myself great spiritual truths breaking forth from any book of the Old Testament, which I study critically, I rejoice in the opportunity to make my fellow-students see these truths as I see them.

### QUESTION XII.

Do you believe and teach that the Virgin birth of Jesus is an historical fact?

### ANSWER S

This is properly a question of New Testament interpretation and teaching, and therefore lies outside of my department. I have never had occasion to teach, and I have never taught, anything at all on the subject.

### QUESTION XIII.

What critical value do you attach to those statements made by our Lord and recorded in the New Testament concerning: (1) Any historical events of the Old Testament? (2) Any question of Old Testament authorship?

## Answers to Questions

### ANSWER U

Our Lord came to seek and save that which was lost. Men are lost, not because of ignorance, but because of sin. One may know the whole truth about historical and scientific matters and be an unregenerate sinner of the deepest dye. One may know little concerning such things and be rich in the knowledge of the saving grace of Christ. He who refused to be a "judge and divider" was surely not careful to pose as a historical or literary critic.

I am disposed to think, therefore, that the statements made by Jesus regarding both matters of history and matters of authorship are not to be used to hinder free inquiry into these matters. They are not to be considered as the final word of a self-announced expert or specialist in the departments of historical research or of literary criticism.

The question is not without difficulties for the intelligent Christian. Perhaps their solution lies in the acceptance of some form of the doctrine of the Incarnate One's self-limitation.

If this mode of accounting for the facts is adopted, then it will mean that the Son of God, on becoming incarnate, voluntarily "emptied Himself" (Phil. ii, 5-12), so that His knowledge, as well as His power and glory, was limited, so long as He lived on earth. On matters of historical or literary character He had only the knowledge that was possible to any Jew of His day.

This view is consistent with a firm belief in the divinity of our Lord.

Many of the more recent writers have adopted the solution as outlined above. It may not be possible to advance any explanation that will eliminate all difficulties. We should not seek to be wise above that which is written. We know that Jesus admitted His ignorance on one point at least. (Mark xiii, 32; cf Acts i, 7.) That this instance was not exceptional may be fairly inferred from many passages in the gospel narrative.

The references given below are to the works of those who accept the "kenotic" view, as explained in the preceding paragraphs. I accept it provisionally as the most satisfactory solution of a profound question, so far as I have been able to study it.

### REFERENCES

Sanday: Oracles of God.

Sanday: The Life of Christ in Recent Research, p. 136. ("The period of His earthly life was really a period—so to speak—of occultation, in which the full display of His divine power was deliberately restrained and held back.")

Forrest: The Christ of History and of Experience, 3d Ed., 1901, p. 105. ("The distinct impression which the life of Jesus as a whole leaves upon us is that He gained His knowledge of outward events through ordinary channels of information. There is no sign of omniscience and no claim to it.")



## Professor Day's Answers to Questions

Forrest: The authority of Christ, 1906, p. 96.

Gore: Bampton Lectures for 1891, The Incarnation of the Son of God.

Gore: Dissertations on subjects connected with the Incarnation, 1895, especially Dissertation II, which contains copious citations from ancient authors as well as modern.

Briggs: The Incarnation of the Lord, 1902, Chapter V.

Walker, W. L.: The Spirit and the Incarnation, 2d Ed., 1901, pp. 337f.

Walker, W. L.: The Cross and the Kingdom, 1902, pp. 128f.

Fairbairn: The Place of Christ in Modern Theology.

Martin: Old Testament (II. Christ as student and interpreter of), in Dict. of Christ and the Gospels.

### QUESTION XIV.

Does your acceptance of any of the results of higher criticism affect in any way (a) Your acceptance of and loyalty to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God? (b) Your acceptance of and loyalty to the standards of the Presbyterian Church?

#### ANSWER (a) No *S*

On the contrary, I am persuaded that a sound and constructive criticism has raised the Scriptures to a position of greater sacredness and power than they have occupied in any previous age. It has simplified Christian Apologetic. It has taken stumbling-blocks out of the path of many earnest inquirers. It has helped me to place emphasis on the essentials of doctrine and faith. It has inspired greater confidence in the divine message of the Book, by compelling me to recognize Christ as the Supreme Teacher, and to see in His word the touchstone of spiritual truth.

#### ANSWER (b) No *S*

The questions that belong to Higher Criticism are not touched upon in the standards of the Church. Nothing is there said touching questions of date, authorship, and literary character of the Old Testament writings. Attention is confined mainly to the purity, sufficiency, inspiration, and spiritual authority of the Scriptures, the last depending, not upon human testimony, but upon that of the Holy Spirit "bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts." On critical questions, therefore, the Confession allows liberty and divergence of opinion. I continue to receive our doctrinal standards "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures."



Yes

No

